

## REMARKS

In the final Office Action dated July 9, 2007, claims 32-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 10 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Haeber et al.* Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the allowance of claims 1-9 and 11-30.

### Rejections Under § 112

With respect to claim 32, in the second to last line, the word "elements" has been substituted for "members" to provide proper antecedent basis. Claim 40 has been amended at line 2, substituting the word "elements" for "members" to provide proper antecedent basis. These amendments overcome the rejections of claim 32-40 under § 112, second paragraph. Claims 32-40 are now allowable.

### Rejections Under § 102

Claim 10 as amended is now distinguishable over *Haeber et al.* Claim 10 has been amended to include a spring biasing force forcing the contact element in the direction of the withdrawal position. Claim 31 has been amended to also distinguish *Haeber et al.* Claim 31 has been amended to include a plurality of driven shafts mechanically synchronized in their rotational movements. Such is not taught by *Haeber et al.* Applicant submits that with these amendments, claims 10 and 31 are now in allowable form.

## CONCLUSIONS

During the course of these remarks, Applicant has at times referred to particular limitations of the claims that are not shown in the applied prior art. This shorthand approach to discussing the claims should not be construed to mean that the other claimed limitations are not part of the claimed invention. They are as required by law. Consequently, when interpreting the claims, each of the claims should be construed as a whole, and patentability determined in light of this required claim construction. Unless Applicant has specifically stated that an amendment was made to distinguish the prior art, it was the intent of the amendment to further clarify and better define the claimed invention and the amendment was not for the purpose of patentability. Further, although Applicant may have amended certain

Appl. No. 10/525,934  
Amdt. Dated September 5, 2007  
Reply to Office Action Dated July 9, 2007

claims, Applicant has not abandoned its pursuit of obtaining the allowance of these claims as originally filed and reserves, without prejudice, the right to pursue these claims in a continuing application.

If a petition for extension of time is necessary in order for this paper to be deemed timely filed, please consider this a petition therefore. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees incurred in this application to Deposit Account No. 03-2769 of Conley Rose, P.C., Houston, Texas.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this communication, he is invited to contact the undersigned to expedite the resolution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

/David A. Rose, Reg. No. 26223/  
DAVID A. ROSE  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
P. O. Box 3267  
Houston, Texas 77253-3267  
(713) 238-8000  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

CAMERON INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION  
P. O. Box 1212  
Houston, Texas 77251